

REMARKS

In the outstanding office action, claims 21-32 were presented for examination. Claims 21-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) in view of EP 992,659 issued to Kruger, which corresponds to United States Patent No. 6,555,570 and claims 21-32 were rejected variously under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over EP 992,659 in view of United States Patent No. 5,515,551 issued to Matsushima; and United States Patent No. 4,883,643 issued to Nishio et al.

Claims 27-32 have been canceled rendering the objections with regard to the same as being moot.

Claim 21 has been amended to include the limitations of “an outer wall and an inner wall configured to provide a double wall arrangement, wherein a bushing is formed in the double wall arrangement from a displaced portion of the outer wall and a displaced portion of the inner wall, wherein the displaced portion of the inner wall and the displaced portion of the outer wall are merged together to define the bushing and the bushing defines an opening through the outer wall and the inner wall”, which applicant respectfully submits is clearly not shown, disclosed or taught by EP 992,659 issued to Kruger. Support for this amendment is clearly found in the specification and drawings of the present application thus no new matter has been added.

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Moreover, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the * * * claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. ' 102, a single source must contain all of the elements of the claim. *Lewmar Marine Inc. v. Barient, Inc.*, 827 F.2d 744, 747, 3 U.S.P.Q.2d 1766, 1768 (Fed. Cir. 1987), *cert. denied*, 484 U.S. 1007 (1988).

Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that claim, as amended, is now allowable over Kruger (EP 992,659 corresponding to U.S. Patent No. 6,555,570) as the same

fails to teach or disclose a bushing “formed in the double wall arrangement from a displaced portion of the outer wall and a displaced portion of the inner wall, wherein the displaced portion of the inner wall and the displaced portion of the outer wall are merged together to define the bushing”. Accordingly, claim 21 is believed to be allowable over Kruger.

Claims 22-26 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 21 accordingly, claims 22-26 are also believed to be in a condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as claim 21 in addition to including additional limitations.

For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art; that the prior art relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference or combined references; and that the proposed modification of the prior art must have had a reasonable expectation of success, determined from the vantage point of the skilled artisan at the time the invention was made. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In Re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970).

As mentioned above, claim 21 has been amended to now require a bushing “formed in the double wall arrangement from a displaced portion of the outer wall and a displaced portion of the inner wall, wherein the displaced portion of the inner wall and the displaced portion of the outer wall are merged together to define the bushing”. Accordingly, Kruger alone or in combination with the other cited references fails to teach or suggest at least the aforementioned limitation. Thus, claim 21 is believed to be allowable over the references advanced under 35 USC §103.

New claims 33-42 have been added to more particularly point out various aspects of the present application and have been carefully drafted to avoid questions under 35 U.S.C. §112. Support for new claims 33-42 is found in the specification and drawings as filed thus, no new matter has been added.

In view of the above amendments and the discussion relating thereto, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Such action is

most earnestly solicited. If for any reason the Examiner feels that consultation with Applicants' attorney would be helpful in the advancement of the prosecution, the Examiner is invited to call the telephone number below for an interview.

Applicant also petitions for a two month extension of time under 37 CFR §1.136 extending the period for response from October 17, 2006 to December 17, 2006. Authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 06-1130 the fee of \$450.00 is hereby given.

If there are any other charges due with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130, maintained by the applicant's attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Christopher C. Boehm/
Christopher C. Boehm
Reg. No. 41,624

Date: December 18, 2006
Telephone: (248) 524-2300
Fax: 248-524-2700